

REMARKS

I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Claims 63 and 64 have been amended.¹ Claims 51 and 58-61 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 44-49, 52-57 and 62-71 remain in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 44-49, 52-57, 62 and 65-71 have been allowed. To that end, it should also be noted that the cancellation of claims 51 and 58-61, and the amendments to claim 63 and 64, are not an acquiescence to the rejection presented in the Office Action. The claims have been canceled and amended for the sole purpose of expediting the issuance of a patent including the claims that have been allowed thus far, many of which are generic to the canceled claims.

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 51, 58-61, 63 and 64 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as purportedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

As claims 51 and 58-61 have been canceled, and as claim 64 been amended so as to depend from independent claim 62, applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 51, 58-61 and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, has been rendered moot.

Turning to claim 63, claim 63 has been amended so as to preclude the argument presented in the Office Action that the phrase “corresponding to the orifice” somehow “imparts more than the ability to encircle the orifice.” [Office Action at page 5.] Applicant

¹ The amendments to claims 63 and 64 are minor, clarifying amendments necessitated by the formalistic rejection of claim 63. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that such amendments do not raise new issues and should be entered in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(a) and MPEP 714.12 and 714.13.

respectfully submits, therefore, that the rejection of claim 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, has been obviated and should be withdrawn.

III. CLOSING REMARKS

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims in the application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested. Allowance of the claims at an early date is courteously solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call applicant's undersigned representative at (310) 563-1458 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0638. Should such fees be associated with an extension of time, applicant respectfully requests that this paper be considered a petition therefor.

Respectfully submitted,

July 6, 2006
Date

/Craig A. Slavin/
Craig A. Slavin
Reg. No. 35,362
Attorney for Applicant

Henricks, Slavin & Holmes LLP
840 Apollo Street, Suite 200
El Segundo, CA 90245
(310) 563-1458
(310) 563-1460 (Facsimile)